DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 305 PS 015 943

AUTHOR Dunbar, Betty-Jo Armstrong
TITLE After-School Programs for School-Age Children and Parents: A Review of the Research.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *After School Programs; Children; *Community Role; *Day Care; Demography; *Employed Women; Federal Government; Government Role; Literature Reviews; Mothers; Parent Participation; Parents; Program Effectiveness; School Age Day Care; School Role
IDENTIFIERS Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

Prompted by the lack of federal involvement in extended day programs for elementary school students in Chicago, this literature review presents background information on national after-school programs for school-age children. Discussed are the history of federal involvement in child care, current federal legislation and programs, the participation of state, county, municipal, and local governments, and the role of the local school and community. After-school program models are listed to indicate that various program options are available which could meet the needs of most parents. The reviewed research concerned (1) families of working and nonworking parents, (2) effects of working and nonworking mothers on their children, (3) parental pressure in child care, (4) the relationship of child care to employment, (5) the effectiveness of after-school programs, and (6) the effectiveness of parent education programs. It is concluded that the lack of adult supervision after school for school-age children has not significantly affected children, most parents leave their school-age children in self-care, after-school programs for school-age children have proven to be advantageous, and parent education has been found to produce positive changes within both parent and child. A four-page reference list is provided. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272305

AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN AND PARENTS: A REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

Betty-Jo Armstrong Dunbar

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Betty Jo Armstrong Dunbar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 015943

Profound changes have taken place in American society over the past several decades which have had significant and numerous implications for American families and children. Two of the most significant changes, during the 1970's and 1980's have been (a) large increases in the proportion of mothers who work, both full-time and part-time and (b) the growing number of children living in single parent households headed by women.

This paper will address the need for an after-school program for school-age children in a large urban community. Relevant issues such as the working and non-working mother, self-care versus child care, the government and community role in providing after-school child care for school-age children, and the effectiveness of after-school programs and parent involvement have been presented as support for the study. A report by the Congressional Budget Office (1983) for use by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families provided demographic data on national household compositions and labor force participation rates

of mothers for the years 1970, 1980, and projected for the year 1990.

Table 1 provides national information on the number and percent of children in various types of households. Data for school-aged children six through nine have been presented. Data projected for the year 1990 for children six through nine indicated that the two-parent family is expected to decrease and the single mother family is expected to increase (U.S. Congress, Congressional Budget Office, Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, 1983). Table 2 presents living arrangements for children under age 18. The number of children living in two-parent families is expected to decrease, and the one parent family is expected to increase in 1990 (U.S. Congress, 1983). Table 3 shows the rates of labor force participation of mothers. By 1990, it is anticipated that there will be an increase in the labor force participation rate of married and single mothers.

These demographic changes have brought about an increase in the demand for school-age child care and after-school programs for school-age children. Coupled with these familial changes, there has also been an etymological change regarding after-school programs for school-age children. As early as 1894, day nurseries and charities as they were then termed, provided care for school-age children. We have

Table 1

Number and Percent of Children in Households of Different Types in 1970 and 1980, and Projected for 1990, by Age Group (Numbers in thousands)

Family Type	1970 Actual	1970 Percent	1980 Actual	1980 Percent	1990 Actual	1990 Percent
All Children Through Age 9						
Both Parents Present	32,127	87	25,786	78	27,276	72
One Parent Present	3,958	11	5,975	18	8,860	23
Mother only	3,704	10	5,614	17	8,358	22
Father only	254	1	361	1	502	1
Other	1,046	3	1,273	4	1,663	4
Total	37,131	100	33,035	100	37,799	100
Children 6 Through 9						
Both Parents Present	13,915	86	10,421	77	10,308	70
One Parent Present	1,842	11	2,766	20	4,103	28
Mother only	1,706	11	2,618	19	3,939	27
Father only	136	1	148	1	164	1
Other	377	2	383	3	391	3
Total	16,134	100	13,572	100	14,802	100

Note. From U.S. Congress, Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, House, 98th Congress, 1st session (1983). Demographic and social trends, implications for federal support of dependent care services for children, (p.74).

Table 2

Living Arrangements of Children under Age 18: 1970, 1980, and Projections for 1990

(Percent distribution)

Living Arrangements	Actual 1970	Actual 1980	Projected 1990
Total Number (in thousands)	69,162	62,064	64,322
Living with Two Parents	85.2	76.6	71.0
Living with One Parent	11.9	19.7	25.0
With mother only	10.8	18.0	23.0
With father only	1.1	1.7	2.0
Living with Neither Parent	2.9	3.7	5.0

Note. From U.S. Congress, Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, House, 98th Congress, 1st session (1983). Demographic and social trends: implications for federal support of dependent care services for children, (pp. 25-26).

Table 3

Rates of Labor Force Participation of Mothers, by Age of Youngest Child and Household Type: 1970, 1980, and Projections for 1990

(Rates in percentages)

	Actual		Projected
	1970	1980	1990
Households with Children under Age 6			
Married Mothers, Husband Present	30.3	45.1	55.3
Other Ever-Married Mothers	50.7	59.3	63.4
Households with Children Age 6 through 17 (none younger)			
Married Mothers, Husband Present	49.2	61.7	70.1
Other Ever-Married Mothers	67.3	74.2	73.8

Note. From U.S. Congress, Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, House, 98th Congress, 1st session (1983). Demographic and social trends: implications for federal support of dependent care services for children, (pp. 25-26).

undergone various changes in terminology for school-age child care such as: "creches," "play schools," "after-school canteens," "school-age centers," "recreational programs," "extra-curricular activities," "day care," "school-age child care," and now in 1984, we have "dependent care for children."

History of Federal Programs for School-Age Children

The first significant federal involvement in day care for children occurred in the 1930's during the Depression. "In 1933, at the height of the Depression, Works Progress Administration (WPA) funds were used to provide jobs for unemployed women and some men, in WPA day nurseries. Four years later 1,900 programs serving some 40,000 children, had been established" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981, p. 16).

"During the Second World War Federal support of work-related day care increased. Funding from the Community Facilities Act of 1942, otherwise known as the Lanham Act, was used to establish day care programs so that women could take jobs in support of the war effort. During the 1940's, some $75 million in Lanham Act and related funding provided care for approximately 600,000 children, thereby enabling their parents to work" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981, p. 16).

During the 1950's and 1960's changes in Title IV-A of the Social Security Act paved the way for welfare reform which allowed mothers to work while providing care for their children. Seligson, Genser, Gannet, and Gray (1983) found that these Social Security amendments "opened the door to funding and expansion of all day care . . . although most of it went to preschool" (p. 21). These welfare reform programs were "targeted primarily at the low-income population and intended either to meet the needs of disadvantaged children or to reduce the welfare rolls by enabling welfare parents to work or to train to work" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1981, p. 16).

In 1972, a special ten member interagency School-Age Day Care Task Force, was created by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Fifty-eight school-age child care programs were surveyed to prepare for possible major welfare reform legislation that year. The findings and recommendations of this Task Force had important policy implications, but its report was never officially published or made available to the public. In 1979, Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) introduced The Child Care Act of 1979, but it was withdrawn because of lack of support.

Federal programs currently providing support for child day care services vary in terms of the types of services

supported, the form of support provided, the eligible recipient populations, and child care standards required for receipt of funds. The four largest Federal programs (in terms of funding) which provide support for child care services are the Social Services Block Grant (under Title XX of the Social Security Act); the Head Start program; the Child Care Food Program; and the child care tax credit (under the Internal Revenue Code).

Other Federal support for child care services includes the Job Training Partnership Act which makes funds available for training, including training in day care, and for provision of day care as a support service; the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program (under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act) which provides for deductions for child care expenses from the earned family income when calculating eligibility for AFDC payments; and the Work Incentive Program (under Titles IV-A and C of the Social Security Act) which requires states to provide child care services for those who need them to participate in the program.

The kinds of day care services supported by the four major programs range from provision of meals and snacks to maintaining program operations. The forms of Federal support provided by these programs range from direct funding for child care services to indirect tax credits for families using child care services. Two of the four programs are

targeted primarily to low-income services. Two of the four programs are targeted primarily to low-income groups (Head Start and Child Care Food); however, the single largest source of Federal support for child care services is provided through the income tax credit which is available to persons who must pay income taxes, thus excluding the lowest-income families. In addition, the child-care standards required for eligibility for receipt of funds vary from program to program.

In 1983, Representative George Miller (D-CA) successfully established the "Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families" mandated "to force the Congress to listen to the needs of children and families" (Seligson, et al., 1983, p. 23). Also in 1983, the "School Facilities Child Care Act" and the "Child Care Information and Referral Services Act" were introduced in Congress. The former act encouraged the use of public school facilities before and after school hours for the care of school-age children. The latter act addressed the need for systematic, centralized methods of matching parents with providers and the systematic collection of data on local supply and demand. These bills were consolidated and incorporated into the continuing Head Start Renewal Bill in October 1984.

Thus, Chapter 8 of Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 relating to community services

programs, was amended by inserting a new subchapter: "Subchapter D: Grants to States for Planning and Development of Dependent Care Programs and for Other Purposes." Section 6700(b)(1) reads: ". . . Subject to the provisions of [previous] subsections, amounts paid to a State . . . may be used for the planning, development, establishment, expansion, or improvement by the States directly, or by grant or contract, with public agencies or private nonprofit organization of programs to furnish school-age child care services before and after school in public or private school facilities or community centers in communities where school facilities are not available" (U.S. Congress, Congressional Record, 1984, p. S13423).

State, Municipal, and County Government

As previously indicated, the United States Congress has mandated that federal grants be distributed to the states to be used for planning, development, establishment, expansion, or improvement of school-age child care services by the states, public, or private agencies. Each state has been given the autonomy to provide its own legislation for distribution of school-age child care funds. Thus, policies vary from state to state.

A fifty state survey to determine school-age child care legislation in each state was conducted in December 1984 by

this researcher. These results have been presented in Chapter IV of this study.

Seligson et al. (1983) point out that in 1981, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Connecticut had enacted legislation that directly or indirectly supported the use of schools for child care. These state legislative initiatives, they added, were designed to suggest only that schools share their existing resources. Local school districts could develop their own guidelines and policies. Seligson et al. also indicated that "funds from state, county, and municipal governments have been used for start-up and operating support for school-age programs and /or tuition subsidies" (p. 33). Examples of such support, they added, have been state level demonstration funding grants; the distribution of federal revenue-sharing/community development block grants to school-age programs; and the use of state or county tax levies.

The School Code of Illinois

This present study was conducted in Chicago, Illinois. As a reference, the 1985 School Code of Illinois does have a policy for before-and-after-school programs. It reads:

> 10-22.18b. Before and after school programs
>
> 10-22.18b. Before and after school programs. To develop and maintain before school and after school programs for students in kindergarten

> through the 6th grade. Such programs may include time for homework, physical exercise, afternoon nutritional snacks and educatinal offerings which are in addition to those offered during the regular school day. The chief administrator in each district shall be a certified teacher or a person who meets the requirements for supervising a day care center under the Child Care Act of 1969. Individual programs shall be coordinated by certified teachers or by persons who meet the requirements for supervising a day care center under the Child Care Act of 1969. Additional employees who are not so qualified may also be employed for such programs.
>
> The schedule of these programs may follow the work calendar of the local community rather than the regular school calendar. Parents or guardians of the participating students shall be responsible for providing transportation for the students to and from the programs. The school board may charge parents of participating students a fee, not to exceed the actual cost of such before and after school programs.
>
> Added by P.A. 83-639, 1, eff. July 1, 1984.
>
> Chapter 23, 2211 et seq.
>
> (Illinois State Board of Education, 1985, p. 59)

Role of Community.

In 1982, Stroman and Duff (1982) felt that reports of isolated efforts to organize after-school programs had been scanty when compared to the need. On the other hand, Seligson et al. one year later in 1983 felt that some community action groups had made important contributions to school-age child care. Seligson et al. state that "communities have helped by gathering information on existing programs, identifying geographic gaps, patterns of funding, and rates of use. When matched with needs assessment data,

this information provides a planning tool for program development" (p. 2). They also mentioned that community action groups have brought together individuals and organizations with common interests and resources to share. Various organizations can contribute to the planning process, coordinating resources, and providing technical assistance. Advocacy groups, parent groups, schools, referral agencies, employers, philanthropic groups, social service agencies, as well as local child care resource centers can be of assistance (Seligson et al., 1983). In responding to a question of who should be involved in planning a school-age care program, Garbarino (1981) suggested that the School-Age Child Care Project has the appropriate answer i.e., to build a broad base of support in the community with several groups forming a coalition.

Levine and Seltzer (1980) felt that the biggest impetus for after-school day care comes not from school administrators and/or teachers, but <u>from families and from the community</u>. Successful programs have survived, Levine and Seltzer indicated, because they have met the needs of a changing society. There is no one right solution for communities to establish after-school programs. Some communities have formed programs directly administered by the schools or a community education division of the schools; other communities have programs administered by

separate organizations according to Levine and Seltzer.

Role of the Schools.

There are both pros and cons regarding the involvement of public schools in child care. Seltzer (1980) explained that public school involvement can take many forms depending on available resources and the degree to which school personnel support the program. Some school systems find extra unused space, whereas other systems use the entire school as a resource. Many programs use school space and custodial service at no cost, while other programs are charged rent plus costs for additional energy use and custodial time. Relationships between day care program staff and school personnel vary widely, Seltzer added. Some principals simply tolerate programs while others actively participate. Reaction to public school involvement has been mixed. Some parents and local agencies voice concern for public schools entering the day care business because they fear community social service agencies could lose their appeal.

The National Child Care Consumer Study (Rhodes & Moore, 1975) surveyed parents regarding their preferences about child care. Almost three-fourths of the parents surveyed felt that their community should have supervised recreational programs. Sixty percent agreed that the schools should provide such activities.

Seligson et al. (1983) presented positive arguments and advantages for school involvement in after-school programs such as: (a) parental support for the school, (b) maintenance or increased student enrollments, (c) empty classrooms represent ineffective use of public resources, (d) decreased vandalism and delinquency, and (e) desegregation efforts as a formal or informal magnet service. Disadvantages of school involvement are also cited by Seligson: "No matter who administers the programs, problems fall into three categories: (a) resistant attitudes, (b) problems of operation, and (c) the absence or inadequacy of school policy" (p. 25).

Levine and Seltzer (1980) propose a few guidelines for use of community schools for extended day programs:

1. Document the need in your community through surveys. This helps to build a larger planning group.

2. Build as broad a base of community supports as possible. Do not introduce it as a school program even though it is based in the school.

3. Find sympathetic principals. A good experience with one principal will reduce the resistance of others in the community.

4. Start small and build gradually in response to need. Set up a pilot program. Fund it modestly, and provide on-going evaluation. Be patient.

5. Allow for slow growth at the beginning. It takes about six to eight months for any new program to gain the trust of parents.

6. Keep the extended day program budget separate from the school budget (if in a school). If it is not clear that the after-school budget is not related to per pupil cost of instruction in the school,

tax-payers or commissioners may erroneously try to eliminate it.

7. Make an ally of the school custodian. They can be useful to access unused space and equipment. Make sure you understand responsibilities.

Chicago Board of Education

The advent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965, provided federal funds to the Chicago Public Schools for extended day programs for some of the school-age students for a few years. However, today, with the federal budget cuts, federal extended day programs no longer exist in the Chicago Public Schools for elementary students.

After-School Program Models

The following outline, modified from Long and Long (1984), presents an overview of the various program models that exist nationwide:

1. Employer-based Efforts in Support of Working Parents

   a. On-site Child Care
   b. Consortia Sponsored Center Care
   c. Information and Referral Services
   d. Subsidies, Vouchers, or Reimbursement Programs
   e. Educational Programs for Employees
   f. Workplace Practices--Focuses on Ways to Help Families Find Care
   g. Flexible Benefits--May Include Dependent Care Options
   h. Child-care Allowances as a Fringe Benefit
   i. Flextime--Scheduling Employee Arrival and Departure Time
   j. Permanent Part Time Work
   k. Flexible Workplace--Home or Office

2. Community Efforts in Support of Working Parents

   a. School-Based Child Care
   b. Home-Based Care; Own Home or Family Day Care
   c. Social Agency Programs
   d. Survival Skills Training
   e. Telephone Hotlines
   f. Safe Home Programs
   g. Programs Involving the Elderly

Various program options, therefore, are available which could meet the needs of most parents.

Research Studies

Effects of Working Mothers Versus Nonworking Mothers on Children

With the increase in the number of children who are left home unsupervised (latchkey children), studies have been conducted to determine the effects on children left in self-care and children with continuous adult supervision. According to Long and Long (1984), most research articles published between 1950 and 1970 on the effect of mother's out-of-home employment, used criterion variables. These variables dealt with

> intellectual performance, emotional and/or physical development, indicators of school achievement, measures of social behavior, or measures of children's ideas and/or attitudes. Combined results of the following studies generally showed no difference between the children of mothers who worked and mothers who d not work: Nye, 1952; Rouman, 1956; Glueck and Glueck, 1957; Hartly, 1960; Hoffman, 1961; Peterson, 1961; Roy, 1961; Nye and Hoffman, 1963;

> Scott, 1965; Banducci, 1967; George and Thomas, 1967; and Nelson, 1969.
>
> The body of research literature that deals at least contextually with latchkey children has attempted to determine whether children are benefitted or injured by living with a mother who works outside the home (Dallas, Gaier, & Emihouich, 1979; Duncan & Morgan, 1975; Etaugh, 1980; Feldman, 1980; Kamerman & Kahn, 1981; Lueck, Orr & O'Connell, 1982; Nye & Hoffman, 1963; & Price, 1979). The growing consensus of this research is that the adverse effects on children and on parent/child relationships, feared by many as a result of maternal employment, have not occurred. (p. 147)

L. W. Hoffman (1974) found that there were no significant differences between children of working mothers and nonworking mothers in "intelligence, personal development, school achievement, social adjustment, ideas, or attitudes" (p. 31).

A later study by A. Farel, "Effects of Preferred Maternal Roles, Maternal Employment, and Sociodemographic Status on School Adjustment and Competence" (O'Connell, 1983) was unique in that it assessed the effect of maternal attitude of women toward work status on their child's development; and secondly, it employed a variety of child outcome measures. In this study of 212 mothers of kindergarten children, Farel concluded there was no evidence that a mother's working per se interferred with the development of her child. There was no significant relationship between a child's successful school adjustment and whether or not the

mother worked. "Children of mothers whose attitudes toward work and work behavior were congruent (want to work and was working, or did not want to work and was not working) scored significantly higher on several measures of adjustment and competence than children of mothers whose behavior and attitudes were not congruent (working and did not want to, or not working and wanted to)" (O'Connell, p. 68).

In 1982, Long and Long (1983) conducted a study of black urban, latchkey and nonlatchkey children in grades one through six in Washington, D.C. They found that latchkey children expressed fear and nightmares to a far greater extent than did nonlatchkey children. They indicated, however, that the closer the parent-child relationship, the fewer the reported fears or dreams. They added that parents should provide a close, concerned interactive parent-child relationship while in contact with their children. Children appeared to perceive a closer attachment with their parents if parent and child shared activities, such as: television, weekend activities, vacations, and sports.

Galambos and Garbarino (1982) found that fear levels in fifth and seventh grade rural children are not any more or less intense in children in self-care as opposed to children with adult supervision. Rodman compared the levels of fear and distress reported by matched groups of 48 children in self-care and 48 children with adult supervision. No

significant differences were found between the two groups (Rodman cited in Strother, 1984). Review of the literature indicates that Long and Long (1983) have researched the nature and number of emergencies that children in self-care experience, or the responses of latchkey children to such emergencies. It was found that fewer than five percent of the children interviewed had been involved in a serious emergency.

In the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services study (Applied Management Sciences, Inc., 1983), the overwhelming majority of parents (86-99%) said that self-care arrangements met their needs. However, half of these parents did mention one worry--that of accidents. According to Long and Long (1984), "certain concerns that receive a great deal of popular attention, such as sexual activity, drug use, or other criminal behavior, account for a very low percentage of reported worries (0-5%)" (p. 160).

As indicated, recent studies support the view that there is no significant difference between children of working mothers and children of nonworking mothers. Gold and Andres (1978) studied 223 ten-year-old Canadian children from two-parent families. Fifty-seven percent of the mothers in this sample worked. Sixteen percent of the children were unsupervised. The unsupervised boys scored lower on adjustment and academic achievement scores,

however, the results of the study did not reach significance.

The School-Age Child Care: A Policy Report (Seligson, 1983) indicated that, "at best, many of the latchkey children experience severely constrained play and social experiences during the time they are out of school. Safe neighborhoods and close relationships with parents may mitigate some of the negative effects of self-care" (p. 19).

Stewart (1981) studied 675 third and fifth grade students with specific attention given to the extent of self-care and child/parental satisfaction. A positive relationship was demonstrated between working mothers, single parents, and self-care arrangements for children. The majority of parents indicated moderate to high levels of satisfaction with self-care arrangements for their children.

Strother (1984) cited a national study of child-care consumers in 1975. About three-fourths of the parents surveyed in the study indicated that every community should have "supervised recreational programs" available to children during after-school hours. Strother (1984) added that

> surveys of parental preferences in child care often reveal only the options that are available--

> not the kinds of child-care services that parents really need or want. Many studies fail to differentiate between methods of care for different age groups, to define age range covered by the phrase 'school-age child,' or to make a distinction between parents who work outside the home and those who do not. (p. 291)

Strother (1984) suggests that

> small-scale studies often provide more accurate information about child-care practices and preferences than do larger studies . . . . Local needs assessments and small-scale surveys may not accurately predict the number of children who will use proposed child-care programs, . . . but, such studies do provide data on which to base decisions about program development. (p. 291),

"Available data," Strother (1984) added, "on the short term effects of after-school programs suggest that children do better with continuous adult supervision in school-based programs than they do when left on their own" (p. 293). She urged communities to develop responses to problems that are tailored to local needs.

Child Care Relationship to Employment.

"The major reason for needing care continues to be employment related" (Davis & Solomon, 1980, p. 497). In a special report by Davis and Solomon (1980), it was found that in an affluent suburb (Shaker Heights, Ohio), the overwhelming reason for needing child care (70%) was

employment related. In addition, 11% of the parents needed or used child care in order to pursue educational or training opportunities; 7% to engage in volunteer activities; and 11% for the child's enrichment or parents' personal reasons. The study concluded that "the data...seem to support the need for governmental policy to encourage a diversity of child care arrangemenets" (p. 499).

A report by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families of the U.S. Congress (1984) cited a survey taken by the Maine Child Care Task Force in 1983. This survey "made clear the connection between child care and employment" (p. 31). Working parents said they would work longer hours and nonworking parents said they would work if adequate, affordable child care was available.

Effectiveness of After-School Programs for School-Aged Children.

According to Seligson et al. (1983), poor data exists nationally on the current demand by parents for school-age child care, on the availability of services, and on the relationship between supply and demand. They added that "major studies on child care conducted during the past ten to fifteen years have not devoted much attention to the question of school-age child care" (p. 9). An exception is the 1983 School Age Day Care Study by the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families of the U.S. Department of

Health and Human Services. This study provided data on the number of latchkey children in Minnesota and Virginia, and the types of self-care and child care arrangements used by families. Kamerman (1983) states that there has been "no national survey ever of services for school-aged children" (p. 132).

This review of the literature produced limited empirical data on the effectiveness of after-school programs for school-age children. In the few studies found, Epstein and Maragos (1983) report an effective after-school program for boys ages 10-17 years old with behavior problems. The curriculum included academic remediation, socialization, recreation, group therapy, field trips, prevocational activities and meal preparation. Findings indicated high attendance rates and satisfaction of pupil progress by parents and teachers. Mayesky (1980) compared first, second, and third grade students in a North Carolina elementary school. There were no socioeconomic, social, or racial differences between the control and experimental groups. Mathematics and reading achievment scores were compared for extended day (ED) and non-extended (NED) day students. The extended hours of participation were 7:00-8:15 a.m. and 2:45-6:00 p.m. The ED children participated in enrichment and remediation activities in math, science, art, music, physical education, tutoring, homework

completion, languages, weaving, drama, dance, karate, and wrestling. Achievement test data were analyzed for both groups for the first two years of the ED program. Results showed that the extended day children significantly outscored the non-extended day students in reading and mathematics. It was concluded that a combination of variables in the extended day environment made a contribution toward the children's academic growth. Sheley (1984) reported that students enrolled in EXTRA, an after-school tutorial program in basic reading and mathematic skills, achieved success in mathematics skills over non-tutorial students.

An out-of-school science program has been described by Gennaro and Heller (1982) as fostering scientific literacy and creating closer relationships between parents and their children. Technology courses in microcomputer, nighttime astronomy, and communications technology were designed for children and parents to attend together.

Jones (1980) reported that 4,000 Title I students were tested in Dade County, Florida. The pilot students in the extended day programs surpassed the achievement of children in regular Title I programs. Carapella and Mertz (1980) reported the implementation study of after-school programs with the St. Louis, Missouri Public Schools in 1979. Data, gathered through interviews and observations, revealed

that: (a) program administrators reported few problems with implementation; (b) the average reported attendance rates for October, 1979 through April, 1980, varied from 70% at one site to 91% at another site; (c) the attrition rate for the first semsester was 18%; and (d) principals indicated that there was little or no coordination of instructional efforts between regular classroom teachers and the after-school teachers.

Genser and Baden (1980), in a report from a school-age child care conference, provided a list of components for effective school-age child care: (a) the political power of parents, (b) widespread need, and widespread access to all groups, (c) use of available space to adequately house programs, and (d) professional staff who possess child development knowledge and skills.

Effectiveness of Parent Education.

> Although a great deal remains to be learned about which aspects of parent education programs contribute to their effectiveness, it can be said with confidence that parent education programs are effective in teaching parents, particularly low-income parents, how to help their children avoid or remediate basic cognitive and school achievement deficiencies. (Rhoda McShane Becher, 1982, p. 1381)

The involvement of parents in the development of intelligence achievement, and competence has been studied extensively. Many of these studies have been well documented by Dr. Rhoda McShane Becher. The following

accounts have been taken from her review entitled, "Parent Involvement: A Review of Research and Principles of Successful Practice" (1984). According to Becher the crucial role of the parents/family/home in determining children's achievement and cognitive development has also been documented by others (Coleman, 1966; Jencks, 1972; Mayeske, 1973; and Moesteller and Moynihan, 1972).

Most of the empirical data that have assessed the effects of parent education programs were launched with federally funded, compensatory education programs. The objectives of these programs were to train low income parents on teaching techniques for their children. Considerable evidence indicates that parent education programs have been effective in improving: (a) the intellectual functioning of children, (b) sustainment of pupil academic gains for one or more years, (c) children's language performance, (d) pupil performance on standardized achievement tests, and (e) general school behavior. Additional advantages of parent education programs have been positive changes in: (a) parent's teaching styles, (b) parental interactions with children, and (c) improvements of stimulating learning environments in the home.

Becher (1984) also reported that specific characteristics of effective programs might be related to those programs which involve:

1. home visits
2. high emphasis on encouraging parental teaching
3. varied program content
4. a one-to-one parent/teacher relationship
5. highly structured, prescriptive, concrete tasks for parents
6. long term consultation for a minimum of 18-24 months
7. specified goals, objectives and activities
8. careful monitoring
9. personalized content which emphasizes the "proper fit" for each parent-child dyad (p. 40)

Becher concluded "that there is extensive, substantial, and convincing evidence regarding the crucial role of parents in the development and education of their children. There is also considerable evidence indicating that parents can be trained to engage in a variety of practices which positively affect their children's development and education" (Becher, 1984, p. 40).

Additional studies also provide enriching information on parent education. Parent training in behavior modification has proven to be successful according to O'Dell (1974). He stated that "effective parent training requires three steps: (a) the parents must acquire modification skills and changes in their own behavior, (b) changes must be implemented with the child, and (c) changes must generalize and persist" (p. 430). O'Dell added that studies

by Wahler, Zeilberger, and Hawkins have found "that when parent's behaviors change so that [the child's] desired behaviors receive reinforcement from the parent and undesirable behaviors are ignored or punished, the child's behavior changes in desired directions. Often this change is dramatic" (p. 430).

Summary

The review of literature has presented background information on national after-school programs for school-age children. The history of federal involvement in child care, and current federal legislation and programs have been discussed. The participation of the states, county, municipal, and local governments have been addressed. The role of the local school and community has been highlighted along with national after-school program models.

Various literature reviews and research studies have been presented on such issues as: (a) families of working and nonworking parents, (b) the effects of working and nonworking mothers on their children, (c) parental pressure in child care, (d) the relationship of child care to employment, (e) the effectiveness of after-school programs, and (f) the effectiveness of parent education programs. Studies have shown that the lack of adult supervision after school for school-age children has not had significant effects on the children. Most parents have left their school-age

children in self-care as opposed to day center care or after-school programs. After-school programs for school-age children have proven to be advantageous to children and parent education has been found to produce positive changes within both the parent and the child.

REFERENCES

Applied Management Sciences, Inc. (1983). School-age day care study: Final report (Contract No. 105-81-C-001). Washington, DC: Office of Human Development Services.

Banducci, R. (1967). The effect of mother's employment on the achievement, aspirations, and expectations of the child. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 46, 263-267.

Becher, R. M. (1982). Parent education. In Encyclopedia of educational research. New York: McMillan.

Becher, R. M. (1984). Parent Involvement: A review of research and principles of successful practice. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Carapella, R., & Mertz, R. (1980). Missouri. (ERIC Reproduction Service ED 198 229).

Children's Defense Fund. (1982). America's children and their families: Key facts. Washington, D.C.: CDF Publications.

Davis, J., & Solomon, P. (1980). Day care needs among the upper middle classes. Child Welfare, 59 (8), 497-499.

Epstein, N. & Maragos, N. (1983). Treating delinquent-prone adolescents and preadolescents. Social Work, 28, 66-68.

Galambos, N. L., & Garbarino, J. (1982). Identifying the missing links in the study of latchkey children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 273).

Garbarino, J. (1981). Latchkey children: How much of a problem? Education Digest, 46 (6), 14-16.

Gennaro, E. & Heller, P. (1982). Early Adolescence: Out-of-school science experiences. Science and Children, 20, 22-23.

Genser, A. & Baden, C. (Eds.) (1980). School-age child care: Programs and issues. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, College of Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Secondary Education.

George, E. E. & Thomas, M. A. (1967). A comparative study of children of employed and unemployed mothers. Psychology Studies, 12, 32-38.

Gold, D. A. & Andres, D. (1978). Developmental comparisons between ten year old children with employed and non employed mothers. Child Development, 49, 75-84.

Hartley, R. E. (1960). Children's concepts of male and female roles. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 6, 83-91.

Hoffman, L. W. (1974). Effects of maternal employment on the child: A review of the research. Developmental Psychology, 10, 204-228.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1985). The school code of Illinois. St. Paul, Minn: West Publishing Co.

Jones, J. L. (1980). Florida: (ERIC Reproduction Service EJ 216 085).

Kamerman, S. B. (1983). The child care debate: Working mother vs. America. Working Woman, 8, (11), 131-135

Leedy, P. D. (1980). Practical research-planning and designing. New York: Macmillan.

Levine, J. A. & Seltzer, M. (1980, September). Why are the children staying after school? (And why are they so happy about it?). Redbook, 24-26.

Long, L., & Long, T. (1983). The handbook for latchkey children and their parents. New York: Arbor House.

Long, T. J., & Long, L. (1984). Latchkey children. In L. Katz (Ed.), Current topics in early childhood education. New Jersey: Ablex.

Long, T. J. (1983). Working parents, schools, and children in self-care. Maryland: (ERIC Reproduction Service ED 238 552).

Mayesky, M. E. (1980). North Carolina: (ERIC Reproduction Service ED 184 675).

Nelson, D. C. (1969). A study of school achievement among adolescent children with working and non-working mothers. Journal of Educational Research, 62, 456-458.

Nye, F. I., & Hoffman, L. W. (1963). The employed mother in America. Chicago: Ran McNally & Co.

O'Connell, J. C. (1983, January). Research in review--children of working mothers: What the research tells us. Young Children, 63-70.

O'Dell, S. (1974). Training parents in behavior modification: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 418-433.

Rhodes, T. W., & Moore, J. C. (1975). National child care consumer study. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Child Development.

Seligson, M., Genser, A., Gannet, E., & Gray, W. (1983). School-age child care: A policy report. Wellesley, MA: Center for Research on Women. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 433).

Seltzer, M. (1980, Fall). Planning for school age child care in public schools. Day Care and Early Education.

Sheley, J. F. (1984). Evaluation of the centralized, structured, after-school tutorial. Journal of Educational Research, 77, 213-18.

Stewart, M. (1981). Children in self-care: An exploratory study. Greensboro, NC: Family Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 604).

Stroman, S. H., & Duff, R. E. (1982). The latchkey child: Whose responsibility? Childhood Education, 59, 76-79.

Strother, D. B. (1984). Latchkey children: The fastest growing special interest group in the schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 290-293.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1983). Child care arrangements of working mothers: June 1982. Current population reports. (Series P-23, No. V29). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1981). Child care and equal opportunity for women. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. House. (1983). Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. 98th Cong., Demographic and social trend: Implications for federal support of dependent-care services for children and the elderly. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. House. (1984). Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families. 98th Cong. Families and child care: Improving the options. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. Senate (1984). Congressional Record, 130, S13423. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress. Senate (1984). School facilities child care act. Calendar No. 938, Report No. 98-494, S1531. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (1983). Census of population and housing, census tracts, Chicago, IL. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau (1983). Time of change: 1983 handbook on women workers, Bulletin 298. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Wallace, P. A. (1980). Black women in the labor force. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.